July 29, 1949.

Dr. M. R. Zelle,
Laboratory of Bacteriology,
Cornell University,
Ithaca, N. Y.

Dear Max:

H-168, Lacy.Xyly.Mtly. etc., has been recovered from the cultures you lately sent, and by now you must have received a copy which has been mailed to you. We tried to reproduce the loss of Xyl+, but in several hundred tests, every Mtly has been Xyly. The presumption of a second crossing seems to be most likely, but unprovable. I wonder then how much of the work on H168 depended on the persistence of the Xyl-? As I have lately been trying to think about it, your single-cell work was directed at answering several questions: a) that single cells so segregate, certainly proven beyond doubt. b) whether the aberrant ratios could be explained by lethals— very likely, but not directly provable because [probably] of multinucleate cells. c) whether there are two or four strands, and whether segregation occurs in one or two divisions -- the answer to this is a little uncertain, because the previous heterozygotes had one type of segregant so predominant. H-206 should be a superior stock for answering this question, because the 3 classes which do occur are so nearly equal in frequency. I can't yet answer your question about H-206; if you are having trouble resiolating it, let me know and I'll send you another stock. I don't know what else it is heterozygous for.

If you've gotten back to work, let's discuss what's next.

Sincerely,